

Remarks

Applicants and the undersigned reviewed the pending office action carefully. In light of the accompanying positions presented herein, this application is believed to be condition for allowance.

Applicants appreciate acceptance of the corrected drawings previously submitted. Concerns are now raised, however, with regard to schemes 1 and 2 presently incorporated into the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assessment that separate figures are required. Even so, corresponding Figures 12 and 13 are hereby submitted in conjunction with a substitute specification, to facilitate allowance of this application.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not sufficiently enabled. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's concern, but respectfully disagree. As would be understood by those skilled in the art, the substrate shown in scheme 2 (now Figure 13) is illustrative of any hydroxylated substrate. As described more specifically in Example 3b, an indium tin oxide (ITO) substrate can be treated to provide hydroxy-functionalization. Condensation of the resulting hydroxy functionalities with any aminoalkyltrialkoxysilane reagent would proceed just as with the particular silane reagent shown. Such reactions are also well-known to those skilled in the art, and condensation of a hydroxylated substrate with a silane is sufficiently enabled. The rejection should be withdrawn, with claim 18 allowed to proceed toward issue.

Claims 7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Again, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's concern, but respectfully disagree. The (-X=X-) structural components can be understood with reference to claim 1: another π -bonded component comprising at least one carbon or at least one heteroatom. (See, e.g., without limitation, Figure 9). As would be understood by those

skilled in the art, such a term is quite definite. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn, with the subject claims allowed to proceed toward issue.

Applicants appreciate the withdrawal of several prior art references. However, several claims remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by both Meyer and Fleck. Applicants respectfully disagree, in that neither reference describes compounds capable of hydrogen-bond formation/interaction or provide corresponding hydrogen-donor or hydrogen-acceptor moieties, as would be understood by those skilled in the art. Nonetheless, independent claims 1 and 12 are hereby amended solely for purpose of clarification, without further limitation, to more clearly recite the hydrogen-bonding available through use of the present invention. Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn, with the subject claims allowed to proceed toward issue.

Lastly, several claims remain rejected for reasons of obviousness- type double patenting, in view of the prior Marks patent. Again, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position, in that the prior Marks patent does not disclose or suggest the present compounds. Rather, the chromophore compounds in the prior Marks patent employ silyl chemistry for self-assembly. Such chemistry is unrelated to hydrogen bond formation and would quite clearly lead one away from the present invention. As such, this rejection should also be withdrawn, with the subject claims allowed to proceed toward issue.

This application is now believed to in condition for allowance. Consistent therewith, prompt favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should any issue remain. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Rodney D. DeKruif
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 35,853

Date: October 19, 2006
REINHART BOERNER VAN DEUREN s.c.
Attn: Linda Kasulke, Docket Clerk
1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone: 414-298-8360
Facsimile: 414-298-8097